81-13

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 24 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No.

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1981

Robert L. Menegus, Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.,
Defendant-Appellee

Civil Action

On Appeal from the Supreme Court

of New Jersey

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Robert L. Menegus, pro se

70 Campbell Avenue

Clifton, New Jersey 07013

No Telephone

For Defendant:

Carpenter, Bennett & Morrissey

744 Broad Street

Newark, New Jersey 07102

(201) 622-7711

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether some employees of Defendant Corporation have conspired to damage a former, effective employee and his family and friends.

2. Whether some employees of Defendant Corporation have been intimidating many non-employees.

3. Whether some employees of Defendant Corporation have conspired to foment lawlessness over a wide region outside the corporate domain.

Above questions are generated by four declarative counts specified in Complaint.

Said four counts follow immediately.

COMPLAINT

Count I: Malicious conspiracy to cause discharge from employment and to obstruct future employment.

Count II: Conspiracy to commit atrocious assault and poisoning.

Count III: Conspiracy to incite crime in the population.

Court IV: Conspiracy to obstruct justice.

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Authorities

Jurisdictional Statement:

Jurisdiction, Constitutional Issues, Statement, Conclusion.

Volume 1:

Complaint, Brief, Transcript of Trial, Appendices.

Volume 2:

Legal and Factual Contentions as answers to about 650 questions from Attorneys for Defendant.

Volume 3:

Proceeding in the Supreme Court of New Jersey. Did not get into Court.

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Volume 4:

Proceedings in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Paterson, and in its Appellate Division, Trenton.

Volume 5:

Technical Reports.

AUTHORITIES

1. Constitution of the United States.

2. Transcript of Trial, Superior Court of New Jersey, 25 October 1979, Paterson Courthouse. Case of Menegus v. Du Pont. Docket No. L-49888-77.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Jurisdiction

Superior Court of New Jersey in Paterson dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice on 25 October 1979, alleging "not a scintilla of evidence." Dismissal was a translation of a bald-faced lie contributed by Defendant's lawyer.

Appellate Division of Superior Court affirmed said judgement without opinion on 27 January 1981, implying by quote that "all issues of law raised are without merit." During November and December of 1980, a spy came from the Appellate Division in Trenton to Clifton, where he recruited several other amateur spies from the local apparatus connected with teenage prostitution. Plaintiff has been

spied on for twenty-five years that he knows of, and in general his very life depends on recognizing promptly members of subject apparatus. In this instance, only mild terrorism was the purpose of said spying by "winners." A shibboleth of the apparatus.

Supreme Court of New Jersey dismissed Plaintiff's appeal on 15 April 1981. Case did not get into Court. No reason was given formally; evidently Defendant's Attorneys managed again to stall. They said Supreme Court does not have jurisdiction. Plaintiff does not know whether or not this argument has merit. For:

Three years ago cost of legal advice was quoted as "million dollars," now as "thousands and thousands."

Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States is defined by the Constitution. Article III, Section 2. Whether the proceeding is to be by direct Appeal or by Writ of Certiorari first Plaintiff is unable to specify, since he is not a lawyer and no lawyer will advise him.* In all events, the object is to review a lower Court decision that Plaintiff contends is without merit, especially since evidence other than courtroom testimoney was formally expunged from the case.

* Short of an a priori large fee.

Constitutional Issues

Defendant Corporation has conspired over a period of twenty-one years to deprive Plaintiff of his:

1) Right to be secure in his person, reputation, and property,

2) Right to work and enjoy the fruits thereof,

3) Right to domestic and possibly marital tranquility,

4) Right to privacy,

5) Right to seek redress from the local Police, or from any law enforcement agency whatever,

6) Right to travel freely within the United States for the purpose of furthering the value of his letters patent, and

7) Right to associate with family, friends, and merchants for whatever purpose. The entire local community is demoralized by terrorism; Plaintiff's only safe recourse is to live in seclusion, which amounts to being three-quarters dead.

Apart from the Constitution of the United States and its unassailable, creative objectives, there is in effect a highly arbitrary structure of questionable ritual and an all-pervading corruption and non-feasance interwoven in said structure that have operated to frustrate Plaintiff's remedy in the State of New Jersey for three years. Nevertheless, as during the past twenty-one years, Plaintiff adheres to his conception of law and order.

Above allegations are specified in detail in Plaintiff's Complaint and in his Legal and Factual Contentions submitted to the Superior Court of New Jersey on 31 August 1979.

Statement

Plaintiff submits his Complaint to the Supreme Court of the United States and prays that it will be compared with recorded courtroom testimony and with his Legal and Factual Contentions. See Volumes 1 and 2.

Plaintiff contends his Complaint is upheld by courtroom testimony, and therefore that Superior Court's dismissal on 25 October 1979 is without merit. Dismissal was uttered on the instruction of Defendant who alleged "total lack of proof" in the face of evidence from a dozen witnesses whose absolutely indepedent statements uphold Complaint.

Subsequent Defendant's arguments to the Appellate Division and to the Supreme

Court of New Jersey have been based on no facts worthy of the title, and rest solely on said dismissal without merit.

Complaint alleges in detail how rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and implemented by the system of law enforcement were and are violated by employees of Defendant Corporation. Plaintiff contends that a minority of said employees, numbering hundreds, have continued to foment mob action and conspiracy for more than twenty years. Some of alleged conspiracy was divulged in Court by most of the witnesses. Myriad torts remain unspoken.

Obviously three New Jersey Courts and every Constituted public organization, Municipal, State, and Federal, have not contributed to the remedy of intolerable

conditions specified. Quite the opposite: Police have been incriminated along with thousands of others including Plaintiff's family and friends, ordinary citizens, Clifton City Hall, Paterson Courthouse, Appellate Division, Office of the U. S. President, and industrial corporations. Lunatics incited by Defendant employees continue to harass Plaintiff, awaiting the opportunity that sooner or later will present itself, in spite of Plaintiff's seclusion. Plaintiff has been dangerously poisoned by lunatics, Clifton Police, pseudo-medical practitioners, and father in Campeche, Mexico; Claymont, Delaware; Wick, Scotland; Clifton, New Jersey; and less seriously hundreds of times.

Plaintiff submits that Supreior Court in Paterson did not comprehend his Complaint and the corroborating horrors of

conspiracy averred by witness after witness, all of whom are perverted by two decades of incessant slander fabricated against Plaintiff, largely by people named in Complaint. See transcript. This is the true face of total conspiracy.

By contrast with the confusion of a stunned judge, many employees are well informed about subject conspiracy, for they were present at its inception. One operating department of several in Defendant Corporation disintegrated into oblivion because of madness that had become the natural state of said department. Sensible people fled the scene of corporate lawlessness. Yet all the ignorant opportunities, but one, who were primarily responsible for subject conspiracy retired peacefully, it would appear.

Plaintiff hopes his case will receive appropriate attention by the Supreme Court of the United States. Toward this end Plaintiff does not argue in children's - book style, a forensic device affected by Defendant's lawyers, on the apparent presumption that Judges have an attention span of about one minute. Rather, Plaintiff has not consciously withheld evidence on either side of his case, which has involved thousands of people over a span of two decades, 180 degrees of longitude, and 80 degrees of latitude. In this connection Plaintiff reiterates:

See Plaintiff's Legal and Factual Contentions. Two New Jersey Courts find so-called regulations not allowing same as evidence.

These detailed and accurate facts set

down at the time of event were expunged from trial, 25 October 1979, in Paterson, and later were expunged as an "Exhibit" from the Appellate Division, 27 May 1981, in Trenton. Yet the Supreme Court of New Jersey as of this date holds nine copies.

Conclusion

Plaintiff did not get a fair trial in New Jersey. Moreover, Dismissal of Complaint was not just on the basis of courtroom testimony.

All-pervading conspiracy breeds indifference in a system already corrupted by subject apparatus, which every small businessman is well aware of. Police indifference, if not worse.

Plaintiff's life has been wrecked and he has been crippled by chemical poison

seven times. He has fought every excrescence of subject conspiracy for half his adult life. There is no possibility, with justice, of recovery.

It is long past the date when Defendant Corporate Employees should have been held responsible and should have been enjoined to cease and desist.

Robert L. Menegus

Robert L. Menegus, pro se

Date: 22 June 1981